CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

Vol. LXVII PITTSBURGH, PA., MAY 1933 No. 5

The Axioms of Christion Civil Government

THE Christian conception of civil government, while seldom absent from the consciousness of the followers of Jesus Christ in any age has shown a greater fluctuation in form, extent, power and expression than perhaps any other phase of Christianity unless it be the supremacy of Christ in the domain of philosophy.

But through all its changing form and expression it has left the percipitate of ideas that has taken the form of political maxims which are steadily becoming the basis of the governments of the world. Not all of them are equally accepted yet all of them are slowly approaching the axiomatic state in the sphere of political science.

A simple enumeration of them may be helpful in shaping political thought and life. They are as follows:

1. Jesus Christ is the source of all political authority. The supreme ruler of all nations.

2. The highest good of the whole community is the one end of all civil government.

3. The people of a country are the chief item of its wealth.

4. Equality in rights and opportunities must be guaranteed to all.

5. Aggressive and destructive force is self destructive.

6. Only when it coincides with the law of God is it true that *vox populi vox Dei est.*

7. The law of nations should coincide with the law of God and govern in all international relations.

Christianity did not originate all of these axioms, but it either bore them within its fold or adopted them from the world's best outside its own life and it has purified and preserved and applied them all.

He who allows these maxims to shape his political life will never go far astray in either his ethics, politics, economics or his social science. Every ill that plagues modern states can be traced to a violation of one or more of these political maxims. Every real political advance grows out of an expanding conception of them and a growing respect for them. No true success for either individual statesmen or nations is ever achieved by ignoring or defying them.

The hypocrisy charged against many modern statesmen grows out of the acceptance of these principles and maxims as axiomatic, coupled with a failure to comprehend their scope and application. The weakness of many lies in picking and choosing as to which of them shall shape their lives and which may be ignored. A Gladstone, a Lincoln, a Wilson is simply a man of generous capacity who has accepted all of these axioms and comprehended a little more fully their application than the ordinary run of men.

Political idealism is the comprehension of how and where these axioms should be applied, coupled with a hopeful determination to achieve their application in some sphere of political life not yet reduced to law and order by them. "Idealogues," as Napoleon sneeringly called this type, he both hated and feared but they are dangerous and obnoxious only to the transgressor and defier of these laws.

The hope of democracy lies in the multiplication of this type of citizen. The hope and prayer of every true patriot is "O Lord, give us men who can and do carry these maxims in their hearts and are not ashamed of them, however much the world may scorn them." "God's Fools" they have been called, but they are the political salt of the earth.

Why Save the Eighthteenth Amendment?

It certainly is calling for help today. It needs rescue from the hands of the present political leaders who have pronounced sentence of death upon it. Unless we are willing to see this great economic, social, moral and political reform thrust back a hundred years in the next two or three, we shall have to rescue it from the hands of that combination of brewers, guzzlers and political drys that are now in power.

A considerable number of formerly prohibition voters are suffering from a defeatist complex today and are saying with "The Christian Century" "Why save it? Will it not be best to cast the Amendment to the wolves and get away with simply a grant of power to Congress to regulate or prohibit the liquor traffic as seems best to them?" The argument is that this will be more adaptable and flexible and work better in the wet cities.

This question is fairly before us today. There are six definite reasons why we should answer this proposal to yield the 18th Amendment with an emphatic and indignant, "No, Never. Not with my consent."

Sound Ethics

1. First of all, as a government policy it is right according to the standards of Christian ethics. Moreover it is the only policy which is right. For a predatory trade to exploit the weaknesses and vices of citizens for profit can never be right. For a government to tolerate and protect by law such a predatory, parasitic trade can never be right. For a government to make such a trade its tax gatherer can never be right. No majority in the legislature or the electorate can ever by its vote or its fiat, make any such policies right. Government is for the protection of the people against all such predatory evils. No government can divest itself of this responsibility and keep its right to live. As the Supreme Court, in Stone vs. Mississippi has said, "The people themselves cannot do this much less their servants."

No freebooting violators of the law can ever alter this fact. Government to be worthy of existence and command the loyalty of its citizens must crush all such foes. The liquor traffic has no sort of right. It is not a natural or inherent right for any man to drink, make, buy or sell beverage alcohol. It is not a right conferred by citizenship either in the state or the nation. At best it is merely a special privilege, resting upon ancient custom. When such a special privilege becomes a social menace there is but one right course for a nation and that is to withdraw it.

Will Weaken Respect for the Constitution

2. It will weaken the respect for constitutional authority to yield to the present demand for its repeal. Heretofore it has been the assumed fact that when a majority sufficient, after full discussion, registered its will concerning any government policy that settled it, providing the policy was ethically, socially and economically and politically sound. But if this trust in our great palladium of our liberties is to be shattered by the shocks of a paid foreign propaganda, what have we to depend upon? It has been argued that the adoption of the 18th Amendment has done incalculable harm to this respect, because never before has the Constitution been treated with such wide spread disrespect. This argument is based upon an assumption which is not a fact. A study of the history of the Eleventh, Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments will at once reveal this. But a further answer might be that the people who have violated this Amendment never had any respect for the Constitution. They violated every regulatory law which was based upon the Constitution as it used to be. The element that trampled upon the prohibition laws are those described by Burns in his couplet,

"The fear O hell's the hangman's whip
To keep the wratch in order."

For the government and the people to lie down before that bunch of exploiters, guzzlers and crooked politicians, is simply to invite anarchy. This struggle is the Waterloo of society's war against crime. If we lose it we head back toward barbarism.

The Great Conservator

3. The Eighteenth Amendment is the greatest conservator of the last century's strenuous work against alcoholism. In the present beer situation we are just getting a glimpse of the chaos that will reign if we repeal the Amendment. The effort of the wets to repeal all restrictive laws and go back to the conditions of sale that prevailed a hundred years ago is premonitory of what will be attempted for every type of liquor. We have practically scrapped all of our regulatory laws and the fight to get them back would be as long and tedious as that before the adoption of the amendment.

The Intent of the Constitution

4. The Eighteenth Amendment carries out perfectly the purpose of the Constitution in this particular sphere of social and industrial life. Its avowed purpose as stated in the preamble is to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, promote the general welfare." This the Eighteenth Amendment not only has designed to do, but so far as establishing justice and promoting the general welfare goes, it has done these things in a remarkable way. Studying the spirit of the Constitution we see that it was intended to establish the governmental policies wherever it was highly desirable to have uniformity and stability. The governmental policy toward this pernicious special privilege has been developing for a century, but was in a chaotic and unstable condition owing to the fact that its regulation was left to the states and no state could protect itself or its neighbors against the depredations of such a predatory traffic. Hence the need of a uniform national policy. The Courts had established the political doctrine that the liquor traffic had no rights which government is bound to respect. They had also established the doctrine that the state had no right to barter away its obligations to promote the general welfare, to a socially dangerous industry. The inconsistency of living under courts that expounded such law and legislative power that not only tolerated such predatory industries but farmed out the taxes to them grew upon the people until in order to relieve their sense of justice and establish a uniform, correct and stable policy they adopted the Eighteenth Amendment. To repeal it would mean that the entire country would be thrown back into the chaotic and unstable conditions of the pre-amendment days. It would have no fixed policy.

Prevents Loss Through Change

5. The Amendment was designed to prevent the loss and demoralization that comes in industry by the fluctuation in public sentiment in regard to governments policies concerning them.

There is no doubt but that the adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment inflicted loss on many lines of industry temporarily. These were more than offset by the economic gains under prohibition. To shift back again will inflict great losses upon other lines of industry. To shift back again ten years hence would repeat the losses. Public sentiment is as fickle as an April breeze. Especially is this true since the war. The growth in the science, art and means of propaganda, the vast organizations of wealth and capital that have been marshalled for the purpose of swaying public sentiment and the conflicting interests that control public sentiment make it like the weather during storm periods; quite changeable. The Constitution was designed to prevent just such losses and exigencies as the politicians and the world's liquor organizations have thrust upon us in the last year. The only final settlement of this age long controversy is for the wets to give up and accept the conclusions of the Christian conscience and the policy of prohibition as final. Every one desires to see the question out of politics but if the Eighteenth Amendment is repealed it will be a major political issue for fifty years to come with all of the attendant demoralization, inevitable to constant change of policy.

A Valuable Advantage

6. This article being in the Constitution certainly gives a distinct advantage to the drys. As any old time hunter would express it, "The Amendment puts the political sun on their side of the hedge." In every struggle of altruism and righteousness against self interest and exploitation that is where the sun ought to be. That is what government is for. That is why every wet in the world hates it. That is why the wise ones among them care little for anything else, just now, than its repeal. To give up the Amendment and depend merely on the congressional power to regulate the traffic is to retreat from the fortified heights and seek refuge in a sandy creek bed. A general who should urge such a policy in a campaign where his country's interests were at stake, would either be considered a copperhead and shot, or so naive as to be worthy only to be cashiered and have his buttons cut off. He would deserve whatever he got. The Drys have fought long and hard for this advantage. Let it be hoped that they are not foolish enough to surrender it under the promises of the wets, that they will respect the Constitution and laws if the Amendment is eliminated.

Sunday Baseball and Football in Pennsylvania

As reported in our last issue Governor Pinchot signed the Schwartz Sunday Sports Bill which is now a law in Pennsylvania.

This law requires that throughout the entire state, in the election November 7, 1933, the question of whether Sunday baseball and football between the hours of 2 P. M. and 6 P. M. shall be permitted shall be put to a vote and the result in each city, town, borough and township determined in each of these political units by whether the majority vote is for or against these sports. If for, the proper authorities are required to enact ordinances for the licensing of the same. Whatever the result in each of these political units next November it will remain the same for at least three years. On petition of a certain number of electors, not oftener than three years, another referendum shall be conducted.

The law has to do only with baseball and football. As regards all other forms of amusements and sports the law of 1794 stands. Its main provisions follow:

1. Baseball and football games of every character are prohibited on the Lord's Day before 2 P. M. and after 6 P. M.

2. Sunday baseball and football games "regardless whether a charge or admission thereto or incidental thereto is made or whether labor or business is necessary to conduct the same" are unlawful between 2. P. M. and 6 P. M. unless the voters in the municipality have first voted in favor of baseball or football on Sunday as provided in the law.

3. Provided the vote in any city, town, borough or township is for these Sunday sports, the proper authorities shall enact ordinances for licensing these sports and no person or organization shall conduct these games until license has been granted them. The fee for license for each game is not to exceed $50.00 in cities of the first and second class. $25.00 in cities of the third class, $5.00 in boroughs and $1.00 in townships.

4. At the municipal election (November 7, 1933) there shall be submitted in the manner determined by the election laws of the Commonwealth to determine the will of the electors in each municipality in the state with respect to baseball and football games on Sunday, the following question, on a separate official ballot:

"Do you favor the conduct, staging and playing of baseball and football games regardless of whether an admission charge is made or incidental thereto or whether labor or business is necessary to conduct stage or operate the same between the hours of two and six post meridian on Sunday?"	Yes	
	No	

5. After the year 1933, but not oftener than once in three years, the same question shall be submitted to the electors in any municipality provided petitioners equal to at least 5% of the highest vote cast for any officer in the preceding election, ask for it.

For 139 years the Pennsylvania Sabbath Law against the commercializing and secularizing of the Lord's Day withstood all attacks. The enemy has at last succeeded in breaking in upon it not to the extent to which they have in many other states, where Sunday movies and all kinds of secular amusements and sports are permitted. But they have driven an open wedge into Pennsylvania's Sabbath law. They will be certain to follow it up at the first opportunity with demands for more radical changes in the law.

If this onslaught is to be stopped now is the time to stop it. The enemy was able to drive this opening wedge in the Sabbath law of the Keystone State partly because the Christian people of the state were asleep, and did not meet the occasion in a statewide campaign of education and petitioning the Legislature and Governor. It may be that this victory of the enemy will serve to awaken them. We hope and pray it will. Now, in each and every community of the state they face the concrete issue of whether the Sabbath shall be commercialized by Sunday baseball and football. Let pastors, church members and Christian citizens who value the Sabbath arise in their might and begin now and continue to next November putting on a campaign of agitation and education on this entire Sabbath question and organize their forces to vote against the secularization and commercializing of the Lord's Day on election day. The National Reform Association stands ready to help all such by providing suitable literature, furnishing speakers and in every other way possible.

THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

Founded in 1867

Devoted to Christian Political and Social Science

Official Organ of

THE NATIONAL REFORM ASS'N

An organization of Christian citizens founded in 1863

Published Monthly, except August, at the Association's Headquarters,

209 Ninth St., Pittsburgh, Pa.

R. H. MARTIN, Editor-in-Chief

WM. PARSONS, Associate Editor

Rates, $1.00 the year, payable in advance.

Entered as Second Class Matter, July 30, 1906 at Pittsburgh, Pa., under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Prohibition In This Issue

The question of liquor and the repeal of the 18th Amendment are now so vital and pressing that we give these subjects large space in this issue.

Dr. Parsons presents six major arguments against repeal in an extended article on "Why Save the 18th Amendment?" You will find in Mr. Tyson's article "How Repeal Would Affect Dry States" compelling arguments against repeal you have not thought of before. The articles on "Pennsylvania Convention on the 18th Amendment" and "Beer Legislation in Pennsylvania" will be of particular interest to our Pennsylvania readers. The article on "Are They Constitutional?" shows the possibility, if not probability, of many of the state repeal conventions not meeting the requirements of the Constitution of the United States and therefore being void. These together with the account of the anti-liquor and prohibition campaigns which are being conducted by The National Reform Association should make this issue of unusual value to those interested in this cause.

The November Election In Pennsylvania

To those interested in public righteousness and moral reforms the election in Pennsylvania on November 7th, 1933, is exceedingly important. In addition to the public officials usually chosen at this general election, the following issues will be before the voters of the state.

1st: The election by state-wide vote of fifteen delegates to the Constitutional Convention to vote on repeal or ratification of the 18th Amendment.

2nd: The question of Sunday football and baseball will be submitted on a separate ballot to the electors throughout the entire state and the issue determined in every city, town, borough and township by a majority vote.

3rd: In every city, township and borough where ten per cent of the electors petition for it, the question of the retail sale of beer will be voted on.

Pastors and other Christian leaders should realize at once the importance of this election and begin to agitate, educate, and organize to secure the largest possible vote on behalf of these moral issues and for God-fearing public officials.

Repeal Status

1. States that have refused to call conventions: Kansas, Oklahoma, Georgia, North Dakota, Colorado.

2. States which have voted for repeal: Michigan, Wisconsin, Rhode Island, Wyoming, New Jersey, New York.

3. States yet to vote on repeal in 1933: Delaware and Nevada, May 27; Illinois, June 5; Indiana, June 6; Massachusetts, June 13; Iowa, June 20; West Virginia, June 27; Alabama, July 11; Arkansas, July 18; Tennessee, July 20; Oregon, July 21; Texas, August 26; Washington, August 29; Vermont, September 5; Maine, September 11; Maryland and Minnesota, September 12; New Mexico, September 19; Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, November 7.

4. States which have fixed elections for 1934: South Dakota, Nebraska, November 6.

5. States where Governor has option of setting date in 1933 or 1934: Idaho, Montana, Utah.

6. States whose Legislatures meet in 1934; Kentucky, Louisianna, Mississippi, Virginia.

Roosevelt and Peace

President Roosevelt is to be highly commended for his aggressive leadership on behalf of World Peace, Disarmament and International Cooperation. For the United States, a great world power, to stand aloof or hold to the position of independent action in world affairs is utterly unjustifiable. We are glad President Roosevelt is abandoning the policy that has dominated our government for the past ten or twelve years. It was under a democratic administration that America took the lead in world affairs and in setting up the inter-national machinery so necessary to world peace. Now that the Democrats are again in power we trust that President Roosevelt will lead our country back into a position of world leadership and, we hope, also to take her place along with the other nations in the League of Nations.

A Needed and Welcome Book

For some years The Christian Statesman has been telling its readers that the present phase of the liquor war, is a foreign invasion by the European wine growing nations, carried on by propaganda and smuggling.

The evidence for this has heretofore been the existence in Geneva of the six power treaty and the public utterances of their false front,—the International Association of Antagonists of Prohibition—whose office is in Paris.

Extensive confirmation of this view has just come to hand in the form of a book, "The Dry Fight in Europe in Relation to America," by Ernest Gordon. It is published by the Woman's National Committee for Law Enforcement. It can be ordered from the Washington College Press, Tacoma Park, D. C. The price is, paper 50 cents, cloth $1.00, pages 246.

Every sincere American ought to read this book. But if they do read it, they will either refuse to believe it, or they will brand the wet political leaders of today as a white livered, sniveling set of copperheads, working in the interest of the wine growing nations of Europe.

The evidence in the book is conclusive as far as it goes. The case is not yet completed and the evidence is not all in, but there is enough presented to make every true American the implacable political foe of the brewers and the wine growers.

But it still remains for some individual or government to dig up the secrets of this international cabal, as the Senate dug up Irene DuPont's taxation letter.

Four chapters in this book contain the heart of it so far as Americans are concerned. They are

vi. The International Intrigues of the Wets.

vii. The Alcohol Capital in European Politics.

(By Capital he means invested wealth)

viii. The Higher Lawlessness in Europe.

ix. The Brewers and the Press.

It will be money well spent, for every Prohibition organization to see that it is put into every Public Library and circulated in every possible way.

Pennsylvania Convention on 18th Amendment

May 3rd, Governor Pinchot signed a bill enacted by the Legislature providing for the state convention on ratification or rejection of the proposed Amendment to the United States Constitution repealing the 18th Amendment. This law provides:

1. That this convention shall consist of fifteen delegates all of whom shall be elected from the state at large.

2. That these delegates shall be elected at the general election November 7, 1933; that the election shall be by ballot, separate from any ballot to be used at the same election; that all persons qualifying as electors shall be entitled to vote for these delegates.

3. That candidates for the office of delegate to the convention shall be qualified electors of the state. Nomination shall be by petition. Candidates for nomination shall state in their petition whether they favor ratification or oppose it. The names of 15 candidates declaring for ratification and receiving the largest number of signers, and the names of the 15 opposing ratification and receiving the highest number of signers, will be the nominees and their names placed on the ballot to be voted on. And the 15 receiving the highest vote will be the delegates to the convention. As the provisions of the law regarding nominations are rather complicated we give them in full below.

4. That these 15 delegates shall meet in the Senate Chamber, Harrisburg, the 28th day after their election and constitute a convention to pass upon the question of whether or not the proposed Amendment shall be ratified.

Whether Pennsylvania shall stand by the 18th Amendment or repudiate it will therefore be decided on November 7th next. The rules for the fight have all been laid down and whether the Drys like them or not they will have to fight repeal by these rules or not fight it at all. Electing the convention delegates by state wide vote instead of by state senatorial or representative districts we believe to be contrary to the intention of our forefathers as to the changing of the Constitution and also a decided advantage to the Wets because it will put back of all of the 15 Wet nominees, the corrupt, machine-controlled vote of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. But the losers in many a battle have had the advantage over those who came out victorious in the fight. The only thing for the Drys to do is to fight all the harder because the Wet Legislature in enacting a convention bill and the Dry Governor in signing it (for some reason which may be explicable to Divine Providence but is inscrutable to us) have given the enemy the decided advantage. It is nearly six months before the election of the delegates. Now is the time to begin to organize by counties, cities, towns, boroughs and precincts and put on a campaign to mold public sentiment against repeal and elect delegates who will stand by the 18th Amendment.

Nomination of Candidates

"Candidates for the office of delegate to the convention shall be qualified electors of the state. Nominations shall be by petition and not otherwise. A single petition may place in nomination any number of candidates for delegate, not exceeding the total number of such delegates to be elected, and nomination petitions shall be signed by at least two thousand resident voters in each of at least ten congressional districts in the state." Nomination shall be without party or official designation but the nominating petitions shall contain a statement by each nominee to the effect that he favors ratification or that he opposes ratification of the proposed amendment. No nominating petition for delegate shall contain the name of any nominee whose position as stated therein is different from that of any other nominee as stated therein. Any number of petitions may be circulated for a candidate or group of candidates, and, when filed, shall be considered as one petition for that candidate or group of candidates. Signatures shall not be obtained on any petitions prior to one hundred and twenty days before the date of the election.

All nomination petitions shall be filed with the Secretary of the Commonwealth not less than sixty (60) days before the date of the election.

The two groups of nominees shall be the fifteen having the largest number of signers to their petitions among those favoring ratification, and the fifteen having the largest number of signers to their petitions among those opposing ratification."

Are They Constitutional?

An exceedingly interesting and important question regarding the State Conventions which the Legislatures of a number of states have already provided to act upon the proposed amendment to repeal the 18th Amendment is, are they being set up in such a way as to meet the requirements of the Constitution (Article V) as to its amendment? For example, in Pennsylvania all the delegates are to be elected by the state at large and all are to declare in their nomination papers whether they will vote for or against ratification. The Supreme Court of Maine says that both of these requirements are contrary to the requirements of the Constitution of the United States.

The Senate of Maine on March 20, 1933, submitted to the Justices of the Supreme Court of that state a series of questions regarding a bill then before the Senate providing for the creation of a Constitutional Convention in that state to pass on the proposed 21st Amendment, for an advisory opinion. Following are three of these questions and the court's answers:

Question Six: Does the provision of article V of the Constitution of the United States that amendments thereto shall be valid "when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several states or by conventions in three-fourths thereof as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress" permit the ratification of an amendment submitted by the Congress to conventions in the several states to be passed upon by referendum?

Answer: An amendment to the Constitution of the United States is valid only when ratified in accordance with the provisions of Article V thereof. This does not provide for ratification by referendum vote and such procedure would be invalid.

Question Seven: If the provisions of article V of said federal constitution do not permit an amendment to said constitution to be ratified by referendum vote, is it permissible for the state under the terms of said article V to organize a convention wherein the delegates entitled to participate therein are all to be elected in the state at large?

Answer: There are no statutory or constitutional provisions, either Federal or State, which dictate the manner in which delegates shall be elected. Nor do we find judicial definition of the legislative prerogatives.

The only guide is the practice which has been followed in the past with respect to constitutional conventions.

The members of a convention such as is contemplated by article V of the Constitution of the United States are representatives of the people, chosen by the duly qualified electors to perform a legislative duty. The principle distinction between a convention and a legislature is that the former is called for a specific purpose, the latter for general purposes. Although a convention is summoned by the legislature, it derives its power from the sovereign people. It has, accordingly, been the practice to have as delegates those fairly representing the political subdivisions of the state. The Continental Congress summoned the different colonies "to call a full and free representation of the people" for the purpose of organizing their governments. This demand was answered by the summoning in every colony of delegates fairly apportioned according to population and location. The Federal Constitution was ratified by conventions called by the legislatures of the several states and organized in a similar manner. The Act of Separation by which Maine became a state provided for a convention which, with other duties, was required to draft a constitution. The delegates were chosen from the several towns within the district.

It is evident, therefore, that in every constitutional convention of which we have knowledge, delegates have been chosen, not at large, but from the various localities within the state. By this method the requirement has been met that the members of the body selected to make modifications in the fundamental law should fairly represent the people whom they serve.

In view of the foregoing, we do not deem it permissible for the state, under the terms of article V of the Federal Constitution, to organize a convention wherein the delegates entitled to participate are all elected at large.

Question Ten: Must a convention assembling in a state to pass upon an amendment to the Constitution of the United States and submitted by vote of the Congress to the action of conventions in the several states be a deliberative convention?

Answer: A convention is a body or assembly representative of all the people of the state. The convention must be free to exercise the essential and characteristic function of rational deliberation. This question is, therefore, answered in the affirmative.

According to this opinion the Constitutional Convention provided by the law enacted in Pennsylvania is unconstitutional and, therefore, void. The same is true of the law providing for these conventions in a number of other states. Of course, the opinion of the Supreme Court of Maine is not final in this matter. Only the Supreme Court of the United States can decide it finally. But the opinion of Maine's Supreme Court indicates that many a legal battle over repeal may be ahead of us and that the Wets in their mad determination and haste to get the 18th Amendment out of the Constitution may have postponed, if not defeated for all time, their purpose.

Association Activities

Fayette County Educational Campaign, April 24 to May 7th. (By Rev. C. J. Whitlatch, D.D., Chairman of County Committee and Pastor of Asbury M. E. Church, Uniontown, Pa.)

Cameron Ralston has come and gone but the influence of his work will live on so definitely that we have every reason to believe that the results will be felt most definitely next fall when we come to consider the 18th Amendment and the Sabbath laws. We learned many things during his stay; not so many new things but things, which, if we had remembered them would have helped write a different page today.

Cameron Ralston while in Fayette County addressed sixteen of the county's largest High School assemblies; conducted fourteen institutes; appeared before six service clubs giving his lecture on Crime Prevention; and spoke before six mass audiences ranging in number from 350 to 1100. On April 30, a "Better Citizenship Field Day" was held in Uniontown with special speakers in seven churches; Dr. R. H. Martin, President of The National Reform Association, under whose auspices the campaign was arranged, spoke in the Second Presbyterian Church in the morning and in the Asbury M. E. Church in the evening. Cameron Ralston appeared in the Asbury Church in the morning and at a mass meeting of Brownsville churches in the evening. United States District Attorney, Louis E. Graham, delivered the evening message in the Great Bethel Baptist Church while his associate and assistant, James Dilley, addressed 200 young people in the Second Presbyterian Church at six o'clock. Other speakers on the list were Dr. John Coleman and Chester Lewis of Beaver Falls. On Sunday, May 7, Dr. Parley E. Zartman, a member of The National Reform Association staff preached the morning sermon in the Second Presbyterian Church; Dr. Martin and Mr. Ralston addressed afternoon audiences in Dunbar and Connellsville respectively. The evening of that same day found Dr. Martin addressing a mass meeting of all churches in Point Marion and Cameron Ralston in the Asbury M. E. Church speaking to the largest audience gathered together in Uniontown since the days of William Jennings Bryan.

Because of the educational value of this campaign it seems imperative that every preacher, every Sabbath School officer and teacher keep constantly before them that today, more than ever before, wolves in sheep's clothing, both in and out of church are exerting no little effort to help destroy all that for which the church has labored through the years and we need to stand on our guard with the perfect assurance that the battle for civic righteousness has not been lost, just retarded a little by the lethargy of many who ought to have been in the ranks trying to hold the line. We feel that the permanent organization erected for civic righteousness as a result of Cameron Ralston's visit will play no little part to help the tide in November.

—o—

As we go to press a successful two week's campaign in Crawford County, Pa., is nearing completion. Reported next issue.

—o—

On Friday evening, May 26th, Dr. R. H. Martin is to make the address at a county-wide meeting in Altoona, Pa., on the subject "How Meet the Prohibition Crisis?" This meeting is the second session of a conference to organize Blair County for the fight against the repeal of the 18th Amendment.

—o—

The National Reform Association will conduct its usual summer program at Winona Lake Assembly beginning July 6th and concluding August 10th. The speakers in the daily eleven o'clock addresses from July 7th to August 5th inclusive are Dr. William Parsons, Dr. R. H. Martin, Cameron Ralston and Dr Hugh Leith. A four day Christian Citizenship Conference will be held August 7th to 10th inclusive. Full program announced in our next issue. This program is given in connection with the School of Theology, Dr. J. A. Huffman, dean.

How Repeal Would Affect Dry States

H. G. Tyson

Those who would substitute state option for prohibition evidently fail to realize the vast difference in smuggling efficiency between then and now, and the comparative ease with which a small area can be flooded with illicit booze. In the old days it required a hazardous and costly week for the wagon load of liquor to reach the center of the dry states. The booze-laden truck can now reach it in a few hours. After passage of the Webb-Kenyon Act the railroads would not knowingly accept illicit shipments, and their stations in dry states were closely watched. The smugglers now own their own transportation systems, which gives them maximum speed, secrecy, control, and almost unlimited range of movement.

Inter-state Shipments Regulated by Federal Law

Inter-state shipments are regulated by Federal law. The Webb-Kenyon Act forbade liquor shipments into dry states, but the courts ruled that this could not prevent them from passing through dry en route to wet territory. With the Amendment repealed, autos and trucks, under color or passing through, could therefore enter the dry state booze-laden and leave it empty.

A Costly and Ineffective Patrol

But if a way could be found out of this difficulty, which seems impossible, are the dry states prepared to maintain a costly and ineffective patrol, day and night, around their respective borders, covering all thoroughfares and obscure trails, to search all incoming autos, rip open bales of hay, cotton and rags, any bundle in which liquor might be concealed, against the indignant protest of an outraged public? Only by such means could the patrol be effective.

Under state option, with extensive smuggling by auto, screened by a vast inter-state traffic, a border patrol would be even more essential for a dry state than it now is for the Federal Government.

If foiled at the surface the rum-runners would take to the air, which would necessitate a costly air patrol whose line of travel would doubtless be well punctured on clear nights and more thoroughly punctured on cloudy nights, with decoys often drawing off the patrol to make way for rum-runners.

Smuggling More Difficult for the States

Enforcement would be more burdensome and ineffective for the state than for the nation, because:

1st. In the old days smuggling was too sporadic and poorly equipped to make it worth while for the liquor interests to encourage and back it. It is now highly organized and up-to-date. With the Eighteenth Amendment repealed the liquor interests would doubtless become the greatest of trusts. With money-bags bulging as those of no other industry, with its control of the metropolitan press through huge advertising contracts and with its strangle-hold on the nation's thirst, it would be far more powerful than U. S. Steel, the utilities, or the average state, and in its efforts to enlarge its markets it would doubtless spend large sums in propaganda, buying controlling interests in hostile newspapers and conniving with smugglers to systematically break down enforcement in dry states.

2nd. Traffic restrictions, tolerated at the national line, would be bitterly resented at the state line, where traffic has always been untrammeled.

The border state, though usually exposed only on one side, is easily penetrated by illicit booze. Wet strategy would doubtless place the brunt of its attack on the most accessible dry states, break down enforcement, and secure repeal, thus isolating the most tenacious states, and exposing them on all sides.

3rd. Illicit booze more easily penetrates small areas than large ones. For the truck to reach the center of the nation would require a hazzard-and-cost week compared with a few hours to reach the center of the average state.

4th. Under state option the cost of enforcement for the average dry state would doubtless be prohibitory. The state boundary is longer in proportion to its population than is the national boundary, and this is especially true of many dry states. At the same rate per thousand miles of patrol it would cost North Carolina a per capita of about $5.00 and Idaho a per capita of about $35.00 for each per capita dollar it would cost the Federal Government for its entire border patrol.

Little or no help for enforcement requiring methods so unpopular, costly and unpromising could be expected from the Federal Government over the protest of the politically important wet states, a booze controlled press, and an all-powerful booze lobby, against taxing the nation, or draining Uncle Sam's booze revenues for enforcement in dry states.

Liquor would flow into the dry states, money would flow out, and the dry states would bear the losses and foot the enforcement bills.

Shall the State Lose the Power to Curb Booze?

Repeal the Eighteenth Amendment, and what happens? Whether the state remains dry on paper or not, it becomes actually wet. However bad the evil becomes, it has lost the power to handle it. If it tries to limit consumption by high taxes, or a dispensary system with high prices and rigid restrictions, it is on the toes of the liquor interests, which could, and doubtless would, cause it to be flooded with illicit booze.

No state, wet or dry, can afford to lose its constitutional protection, or its power to protect itself against the liquor evil.

5th. If liquor is smuggled over the state line at the same rate per thousand miles of boundary that it is smuggled over the national line, its quantity per capita will be far larger for the state than for the nation. For each thousand miles of boundary of the U. S. proper (that is the line bounding the 48 states) there are more than 11,000,000 inhabitants, but for each thousand miles of state boundary there is an average of less than 2,500,000. At the same smuggling rate this would make a per capita of more than four for the state to one for the nation.

Allowing for the comparatively small population of many of the dry states, and their ample boundaries, we find the difference more startling.

In the following table it is assumed (merely for comparison) that 122,775,046 pints of liquor are smuggled per thousand miles of boundary. This for the nation, according to the census of 1930, would be one pint per capita for each thousand miles, or 10.7 pints for the quantity smuggled over its 10,758 miles of border line.

For comparison with this, 35 states that may be considered actively or potentially dry, have been selected. I am unable to get their

Liquor Smuggling—State and National Boundries Compared

	Population (Census of 1930)	Per Capitas for 122,775,046 Pints Smuggled per 1,000 Miles of Boundary	Per Capitas for 122,775,046 Pints Smuggled Over Entire Boundary
United States	122,775,046	1.0	10.7
Arizona	435,573	281.8	.....
Arkansas	1,854,482	66.2	.....
California	5,677,251	21.6	.....
Colorado	1,035,791	118.5	.....
Florida	1,468,211	83.6	.....
Georgia	2,908,506	42.2	.....
Idaho	445,032	275.8	.....
Indiana	3,238,503	37.9	.....
Iowa	2,470,939	49.6	.....
Kansas	1,880,999	65.2	.....
Kentucky	2,614,589	46.9	.....
Louisiana	2,101,593	58.4	.....
Maine	797,423	153.9	.....
Minnesota	2,563,953	47.8	.....
Mississippi	2,009,821	61.0	.....
Missouri	3,629,367	33.8	.....
Montana	537,606	228.3	.....
Nebraska	1,377,963	89.1	.....
New Hampshire	465,293	263.8	.....
New Mexico	423,317	290.0	.....
North Carolina	3,170,276	38.7	.....
North Dakota	680,845	180.3	.....
Ohio	6,646,697	18.4	.....
Oregon	953,786	128.7	.....
Oklahoma	2,396,040	51.2	.....
South Dakota	692,849	177.2	.....
South Carolina	1,738,765	70.6	.....
Tennessee	2,616,556	46.9	.....
Texas	5,824,715	21.0	.....
Utah	507,847	241.7	.....
Virginia	2,421,851	50.6	.....
Vermont	359,611	341.4	.....
Washington	1,563,396	78.5	.....
West Virginia	1,729,205	71.0	.....

boundary lengths, but a study of the Rand McNally Atlas shows that all but three, Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont, have boundaries very nearly, but most of them exceeding, 1,000 miles.

We will therefore compare the per capita smuggled over a thousand miles of each state line with the per capita for the quantity smuggled over the entire boundary of the U. S. proper. This makes most of the state per capitas in the following table too small. Idaho, for instance, with around 1,500 miles of boundary, should have about 50 per cent more, and Texas nearly 300 per cent more than those shown in the table, but it will serve our purpose.

It will be noted that the per capitas for 1,000 miles of boundary of 12 of the above states would be from 11 to 32 times that of the per capita for the quantity smuggled over the entire boundary of the U. S. proper.

It is evident that smuggling can be fought effectively only at the national line. There the pressure might normally be stronger, but it would be as strong at the state line as the liquor interests would make it.

6th. The only reasonable conclusion is that, while liquor is everywhere outlawed and harrassed by the Federal Government, the state that cooperates for enforcement will be dry. But with liquor legalized and protected to the boundaries of the dry states, with the latest equipment for swift, secret and evasive transportation via surface and air utilized for smuggling, doubtless backed by the liquor interests, with the excessive burden repeal would throw on the dry states, and the large smuggling per capita possibilities for the states compared with those of the nation, state option would be reduced to a theory without power to function, and the state would be at the mercy of the liquor interests.

Beer Legislation In Pennsylvania

We have just received from the Clerk of Pennsylvania and have just finished reading copy of Act No. 91 regulating the sale of beer in the Keystone State.

The hypocritical and lying character of the Act is so manifest that anyone who can read it and not be struck by this must be both blind and dumb. The beverages for whose licensing it provides, beverages with an alcohol content from one-half of one percent by volume to 3.2 by weight (4% by volume) the act assumes is non-intoxicating which it must be to be legal under the 18th Amendment. Then it proceeds to

1. Forbid its sale to all persons under twenty-one years of age; to any insane person or to any person visibly intoxicated.

2. To forbid its sale to any person on any election day—primary, special, municipal, general.

3. To forbid under heavy penalties its manufacture, distribution, or sale by anyone who has not received from the proper governmental authorities, a license for the same for which a heavy charge is made and to sell to anyone on credit.

If it is a harmless non-intoxicating beverage why is its manufacture and sale hedged about with the same old regulations and prohibitions found in the laws regulating intoxicating liquors in the old saloon days? There is just one reason for it. What it purports to make legal is an intoxicating beverage.

Local Option on Retail Sale of Beer

However, there is one redeeming feature about this Pennsylvania beer law which has received little publicity. It provides for local option on the retail sale of beer in any municipality, or township in the state. Whenever electors equal to at least ten percent of the highest vote cast for any office in the municipal or township election at the last preceding election shall petition the local authorities for a referendum on the question of granting such license, the question shall be put to a vote in the fall election in this form: "Do you favor the granting of retail beverage license in.....of ....." If the majority vote is against, repeal licenses shall not thereafter be issued in that political unit and therefore no beer sold. This referendum may be taken not oftener than once in four years.

Therefore, the opportunity is open to the citizens of any city, town, borough, or township to put this issue to a vote at the fall election.